REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of April 6, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

The claims have been amended to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention and to address the issues that were the basis of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as well as to maintain consistency among the claims. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §101

Claims 7-10 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. More specifically, it is asserted that claims 7 and 10 are directed to machine and/or manufacture claims, but both claims fail to cite any physical articles or object.

It is noted that according to MPEP 2106, for products, the claim limitations will define discrete physical structures, which may be comprised of hardware or a combination of hardware and software. Claim 10 recites a modality component server comprising a modality activator and a multimodal engine, which are subunits of the modality component server and are clearly hardware or a combination of hardware and software. Claim 18 recites a system for managing multimodal interactions comprising means for registering a plurality of modality components, means for connecting an activated modality component to a device, and means for conveying a user interaction

8

from the device to the modality component for processing. These different means are subunits of the system and are clearly hardware or a combination of hardware and software.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because of a typographical error in the abstract. The abstract has been amended to correct the typographical error.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Claims 1-6 and 12-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, it is stated that the limitation "said activated modality component" in line 4 of claim 1 has insufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this deficiency.

It is also stated that it is not clear as to which modality component, each modality component or activated modality component, that the recitation "the modality component" in claim 2 refers to.

Claim 2 has been amended to overcome this deficiency. Claim 13 has been similarly amended.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

9

Double Patenting

Claims 3, 8, and 14 were provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory double patenting over claims 1, 11, and 21 of co-pending Application No. 10/741,997.

Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer and thus respectfully request that the double patenting rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-4, 6-15, and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,069,560 to Cheyer, *et al.* (hereinafter Cheyer).

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is method for managing multimodal interactions.

The method can include registering a plurality of modality components with a modality component server, wherein each modality component handles an interface modality for an application (see Specification, paragraph [0049] and step 305 of Fig. 3).

The method also can include initiating a multimodal application from a client device, the multimodal application submitting activation conditions for modality components it supports to a multimodal engine of the modality component server (see Specification, paragraph [0050] and step 308 of Fig. 3).

The method further can include activating a modality component by a modality activator of modality component server when activation conditions for the modality component are satisfied and connecting the activated modality component to the client

device (see Specification, paragraph [0050] and step 309 of Fig. 3).

The method additionally can include conveying a user interaction from the client device to the activated modality component for processing.

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

Cheyer discloses a software-based architecture for supporting cooperative task completion by flexible, dynamic configurations of autonomous electronic agents (see Abstract). Agent-based systems are not new and have been used widely in distributed computing. However, the concept of the present invention is totally different from the prior art agent-based systems. According to one aspect of the present invention, the activation conditions for modality components supported by a client device are submitted to the multimodal engine and can be used by the inference engine to dynamically compare with the current state of the shared memory area, thus automatically activates or deactivates required modality component based on the user interaction without specific request by the client device. This is not the case in Cheyer in which the client request has to be first received and then processed though multiple steps in order for an appropriate agent to be found.

Applicants, therefore, believe that the present invention is patentable over Cheyer. In view of the forgoing, Applicants respectfully request that the claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheyer, in view of U.S. Patent 6,859,451 to Pasternack, *et al.* (hereinafter Pasternack).

Claims 5 and 16 are believed to be patentable because they are dependent on independent claims 1 and 12, which are believed to be patentable as discussed above. Applicants thus respectfully request that the claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: July 6, 2007

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

12